



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,192	01/11/2002	Thangaraj Veerappan	23452-144	6876

29315 7590 12/09/2004

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

SCHLAIFER, JONATHAN D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/042,192

Applicant(s)

VEERAPPAN ET AL.

Examiner

Jonathan D. Schlaifer

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/11/02, 8/20/02.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☒ Other: IDS 6/30/03, 12/9/03.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application 10/042,192, filed on 1/11/2002, with prior art filed on 1/11/2002, 8/20/2002, 1/27/2003, 6/30/2003, and 12/9/2003.
2. Claims 1-40 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 1-4, 6, 11-14, 16, 21-24, 26, 31-34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Peng et al. (USPN 6,252,671 B1—filing date 5/22/1998), hereinafter Peng.**
4. **Regarding independent claim 1**, Peng discloses a method for determining a language in which a document is created (Peng analyzes fonts and content in col. 3, line 45—col. 4, line 5 to analyze language) comprising the steps of: a) receiving at least one electronic document (Peng receives fonts, which are a type of language-specific document in col. 3, line 45—col. 4, line 5 to analyze language); b) identifying at least one character set encoding used in the at least one electronic document (Peng identifies character set encoding in the font documents in col. 5, line 40-65); c) determining whether the at least one character set encoding identifies a language in which the electronic document is

created (Peng identifies character set encoding and language in the font documents in col. 5, line 40-65), and d) indicating the language in which the electronic document is created if a determination is made that the at least one character set encoding identifies the language in which the electronic document is created (Peng identifies character set encoding and language in the font documents in col. 5, line 40-65).

5. **Regarding dependent claim 2**, Peng discloses the step of c) determining determines that the at least one character set encoding identifies at least two potential languages in which the electronic document is created (Peng checks for several possible language matches in col. 5, line 40-65).
6. **Regarding dependent claim 3**, Peng discloses the step of e) comparing at least one group of characters in the electronic document to predetermined groups of characters (Peng compares the electronic document to predetermined groups of characters in col. 5, line 40-65).
7. **Regarding dependent claim 4**, Peng discloses the step of f) detecting at least one identification for the at least one group of characters (Peng checks for several possible language matches and makes an identification in col. 5, line 40-65).
8. **Regarding dependent claim 6**, Peng discloses that the at least one identification is a bit-flag (flags are used for identification in col. 5, lines 1-30).
9. **Regarding independent claim 11**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
10. **Regarding dependent claim 12**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 2 and it is rejected under similar rationale.

11. **Regarding dependent claim 13**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 3 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
12. **Regarding dependent claim 14**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 4 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
13. **Regarding dependent claim 16**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 6 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
14. **Regarding independent claim 21**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
15. **Regarding dependent claim 22**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 2 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
16. **Regarding dependent claim 23**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 3 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
17. **Regarding dependent claim 24**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 4 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
18. **Regarding dependent claim 26**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 6 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
19. **Regarding independent claim 31**, it is a processor readable medium containing processor readable code for performing the method of claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
20. **Regarding dependent claim 32**, it is a processor readable medium containing processor readable code for performing the method of claim 2 and it is rejected under similar rationale.

21. **Regarding dependent claim 33**, it is a processor readable medium containing processor readable code for performing the method of claim 3 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
22. **Regarding dependent claim 34**, it is a processor readable medium containing processor readable code for performing the method of claim 4 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
23. **Regarding dependent claim 36**, it is a processor readable medium containing processor readable code for performing the method of claim 6 and it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

24. **Claims 5, 15, 25, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peng, further in view of Schulze (USPN 6,167,369—filing date 11/23/1998).**
25. **Regarding dependent claim 5**, Peng fails to disclose that the at least one group of characters is an n-gram. However, Schulze discloses in the Abstract, lines 1-10 that n-grams may be used to facilitate probabilistic analysis of whether a language is predominant. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use n-grams to facilitate probabilistic analysis of whether a language is predominant.

26. **Regarding dependent claim 15**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 4 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
27. **Regarding dependent claim 25**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 4 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
28. **Regarding dependent claim 35**, it is a processor readable medium containing processor readable code for performing the method of claim 4 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
29. **Claims 7-10, 17-20, 27-30, and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peng.**
30. **Regarding dependent claim 7**, Peng fails to disclose the step of g) logically ANDing the at least one identification. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that when multiple results are produced by a process, they should be ANDed together so that they may be manipulated as a single unit. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to AND the identifications together so that they may be treated as a single unit.
31. **Regarding dependent claim 8**, Peng fails to disclose the step of g) logically ANDing the at least one identification is repeated until a single identification is determined. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that when multiple results are produced by a process, they should be ANDed together repeatedly so that they may be manipulated as a single unit. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to AND the identifications together repeatedly so that they may be treated as a single unit.

32. **Regarding dependent claim 9**, Peng fails to disclose the step of h) indicating the language in which the electronic document is created. However, Peng does determine such a language, and it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that indicating results to the user helps provide the user with useful feedback about the output of a program, so it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to indicate the language in order to provide the user with useful feedback about the output of the program.
33. **Regarding dependent claim 10**, The method of claim 9, further comprising the step of i) identifying a character set encoding for the language indicated. However, Peng does operate with this information, and it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that indicating information involved in the operation of a program to the user helps provide the user with useful feedback about the output of a program, so it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to indicate the language in order to provide the user with useful feedback about the output of the program.
34. **Regarding dependent claim 17**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
35. **Regarding dependent claim 18**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 2 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
36. **Regarding dependent claim 19**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 3 and it is rejected under similar rationale.

37. **Regarding dependent claim 20**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 4 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
38. **Regarding dependent claim 27**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
39. **Regarding dependent claim 28**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 2 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
40. **Regarding dependent claim 29**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 3 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
41. **Regarding dependent claim 30**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 4 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
42. **Regarding dependent claim 37**, it is a processor readable medium containing processor readable code for performing the method of claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
43. **Regarding dependent claim 38**, it is a processor readable medium containing processor readable code for performing the method of claim 2 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
44. **Regarding dependent claim 39**, it is a processor readable medium containing processor readable code for performing the method of claim 3 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
45. **Regarding dependent claim 40**, it is a processor readable medium containing processor readable code for performing the method of claim 4 and it is rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

USPN 5,771,034 (filing date 5/5/1997)—Gibson


USPN 6,031,622 (filing date 5/7/1997)—Ristow et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan D. Schlaifer whose telephone number is (571) 272-4129. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JS


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER